

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 00783 071154Z

21

ACTION L-02

INFO OCT-01 AF-06 ARA-06 EA-06 EUR-12 NEA-09 RSC-01 IO-10

ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-03 H-01 INR-07 NSAE-00

NSC-05 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 OMB-01 ACDA-05

DPW-01 AID-05 OES-03 /109 W
----- 066545

O R 071103Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 518

INFO AMEMBASSY BERN

AMEMBASSY CANBERRA

AMEMBASSY CARACAS

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY JAKARTA

AMEMBASSY LAGOS

AMEMBASSY MEXICO CITY

USMISSION USUN NEWYORK

USDEL JEC PARIS

AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM

AMEMBASSY SAIGON NIACT IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY VALLETTA

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 783

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: ICRC PARM VS VN PFOR

SUBJECT: LOW CONFERENCE: VOTING ON PRG ISSUE

1. IT STRIKES US THAT VOTING PATTERN OF SEVERAL MEMBER STATES ON
NOW HOPEFULLY CONCLUDED PRG ISSUE WAS EGREGIOUSLY UNFAVORABLE VIS-
A-VIS U.S. INTERESTS. IN MOST CASES, WE BELIEVE THAT SOME FLEXI-
BILITY COULD HAVE BEEN SHOWN, WHICH WOULD HAVE ASSISTED US AT
MARGINAL RISK TO COUNTRY INVOLVED. WE SUGGEST THAT DEPARTMENT
CONSIDER INSTRUCTING APPROPRIATE POSTS TO APPROACH FOREIGN MIN-
ISTRY TO EXPRESS OUR DISAPPOINTMENT AND/OR DISSATISFACTION, NOT-
ING PARTICULARLY THAT HAD VOTE GONE THE OTHER WAY, THE MARGIN
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 00783 071154Z

COULD WELL HAVE BEEN THE VOTE CAST (OR NOT CAST) BY THAT GOVERN-

MENT.

2. AUSTRALIA: GOA DELEGATION IN GENEVA CLEARLY WAS DISSATISFIED WITH ITS INSTRUCTIONS. THERE WERE AUDIBLE GASPS OF SURPRISE WITHIN THE CHAMBER EACH TIME AUSTRALIA VOTED AGAINST THE CHAIR. GIVEN AUSTRALIA'S PAST INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM AND THE FACT THAT THERE WAS NO UNIFIED "NON-ALIGNED" POSITION TO WHICH AUSTRALIA HAD TO PANDER, WE ARE MOST STRONGLY DISAPPOINTED WITH AUSTRALIA'S POSITION: A POSITION WHICH VERY NEARLY LED TO THE CONFERENCE'S APPROVAL TO REMOVE THE PROCEDURAL OBSTACLE WHICH HAS KEPT THE PRG FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE 1975 LOW CONFERENCE.

3. FINLAND: PARTICULARLY IN VIEW OF EARLIER MESSAGES FROM EMBASSY HELSINKI, WE WERE DISAPPOINTED THAT FINLAND'S DELEGATION, EVEN GIVEN POLITICAL DYNAMICS INVOLVED, VOTED AGAINST U.S. POSITION ON EACH OF FOUR PROCEDURAL VOTES.

4. INDONESIA: ALTHOUGH JAKARTA HAD SIGNED CLEARLY THAT IT WOULD BE OPPOSING U.S. POSITION CONCERNING PRG RIGHT ACROSS THE BOARD, INDONESIAN VOTING WAS DISAPPOINTING TO US. WE WOULD NOTE, HOWEVER, THAT INDONESIA ABSTAINED ON VOTE CONCERNING SECOND CHALLENGE TO CHAIRMAN'S RULING.

5. MALTA: LAST YEAR, MALTESE REP WAS ENCOURAGED SUCCESSFULLY TO LEAVE CHAMBER DURING VOTING ON PRG. THIS YEAR, HOWEVER, MALTESE NOT ONLY REMAINED IN CHAMBER ("UNDER INSTRUCTIONS"), BUT CO-SPONSORED INITIAL ALGERIAN RESOLUTION AND ACCORDINGLY VOTED AGAINST U.S. POSITION ON EACH VOTE. TRUE, MALTA WISHES TO IMPROVE HER "NON-ALIGNED" CREDENTIALS, BUT GIVEN SPLIT WITHIN "NON-ALIGNED" ON THIS ISSUE (RVN IS, IN FACT, A MEMBER OF "NON-ALIGNED"), IT IS UNCLEAR TO US WHY MALTA WAS COMPELLED TO CO-SPONSOR THIS RESOLUTION.

6. VENEZUELA: CARACAS REPS FLIP-FLOPPED THROUGH DECISION-MAKING ON ALL FOUR VOTES. VENEZUELAN REP MADE ONE STATEMENT WHICH WAS CLEARLY HARMFUL TO OUR INTERESTS. ESPECIALLY GIVEN CROSS CURRENTS OF LA VOTING, WE BELIEVE GOV COULD HAVE BEEN MORE SUPPORTIVE ON THIS ISSUE.

7. MEXICO: OUR VIEWS CONCERNING MEXICO'S POSITION ARE SIMILAR TO THOSE REGARDING VENEZUELA. MEXICAN REP HERE (AS WELL AS

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 00783 071154Z

VENEZUELAN) WAS VERY NON-COMMITTAL AND FAIRLY UNCOMMUNICATIVE, DESPITE OUR CULTIVATION. AGAIN, GIVEN DIFFERENCES WITHIN LA GROUP, BELIEVE MEXICANS COULD HAVE DONE BETTER AS FAR AS WE WERE CONCERNED.

8. NIGERIA: AMBASSADOR CLARK TALKED OF ABSTENTION FOR QUITE A WHILE BEFORE INDICATING THAT HE HAD JUST RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS FROM LAGOS TO SUPPORT PRG ON PROCEDURE. CLARK WAS OF SOME HELP, HOWEVER, ON ONE PROCEDURAL VOTE. IT OCCURS TO US THAT SINCE SEVERAL SMALL

AFRICAN STATES INDEED HAD COURAGE TO STAND UP AND BUCK AFRICAN
TIDE FOR PRG, NIGERIA DID NOT HAVE TO GIVE WAY TO GROUND SWELL
FAVORING ALGERIAN EFFORTS, WHICH WERE CLEARLY ONE-SIDED.

9. SWEDEN: THE SWEDES WERE AS UNHELPFUL AS POSSIBLE ON THIS
ISSUE. BLIX DELIVERED OFFENSIVE STATEMENT WHICH, IN VIEW OF MANY
DELEGATIONS, JUST DID NOT HAVE TO BE GIVEN. WE KNOW THE SWEDISH
VIEWS ON THIS QUESTION. PERHAPS WE CAN UNDERSTAND THEM MORE THAN
THOSE OF, SAY, THE AUSTRALIANS. NEVERTHELESS, AND PARTICULARLY
IN VIEW OF EXTREMELY CLOSE BALLOTING AND EVIDENT QUESTIONS OF
PROCEDURE ON WHICH U.S. INTERPRETATION WAS CORRECT, WE BELIEVE
SWEDISH DELEGATION WENT FURTHER IN OPPOSING US THAN REALLY WAS
NECESSARY. DALE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: LAW OF WAR, MEMBERSHIP APPLICATIONS, COMMUNIST FRONT ORGANIZATIONS, MEETING VOTING RECORDS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 07 FEB 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: RowellE0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975GENEVA00783
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750045-0568
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750263/aaaaceup.tel
Line Count: 128
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION L
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: RowellE0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 12 MAY 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <12 MAY 2003 by ElyME>; APPROVED <29 SEP 2003 by RowellE0>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: LOW CONFERENCE: VOTING ON PRG ISSUE
TAGS: PARM, PFOR, VS, VN, ICRC, PRG
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006